

since they are omitted by dashed lines. Applicants are unable to find any reference to a primary wireless channel. In addition, the third unit as claimed is also operatively coupleable to the second unit via a wireless back channel. As such, the claim requires not only a primary wireless channel for communication between the first and second unit, but a wireless back channel between the third unit and second unit. Again, the cited portions fail to describe any wireless back channel. Moreover, the claim further requires that the third unit is also operatively coupleable to the first unit via a secondary short range channel. Again, there is no teaching or suggestion of these combinations of wireless channels, back channels and short range channels and information communicated in combination as claimed. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing by column and line number that describes each of the units, primary wireless channel, wireless back channel, and secondary short range channel and communications set forth in the reference alleged to anticipate this claim. Since Applicants are unable to find such disclosure, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 is also allowable as the Okomoto reference fails to teach specific language set forth in the claim. For example, as to claim 1, Applicants respectfully requested the showing as to which elements in the Okomoto reference corresponded to the various claim language. For example, Applicants requested (see page 4 of previous response) identification of the first and second secondary channels. No such showing has been provided. Moreover, the first and second secondary channels are used to provide certain information by certain elements. By way of example, claim 1 requires, among other things, retransmitting, by an intermediate destination unit, the authentication code to the first unit via a second secondary channel wherein the first unit sent the user ID to the authentication unit. Again, Applicants respectfully request identification of the first and second secondary channels along with a

retransmission and which units are the “first unit”, “intermediate destination unit” and “authentication unit” and their respective communication channels as claimed.

In the “Response to Arguments” section, the Examiner cited to two columns, namely columns 18 and 19, but has not identified which element of the Okomoto reference corresponds to each of the first unit, intermediate unit and authentication unit as claimed as the cited portions refer to many different systems and units. The same section stated that the intermediate unit may be the “connection management unit” or the user ID “correspondence establishing unit”. If this is the case, Applicants respectfully request identification of which unit corresponds then to the first unit and the authentication unit and which channel of Okomoto corresponds to the first secondary channel and the second secondary channel. Applicants also then request a showing as to where the cited reference teaches that the connection management unit or the correspondence establishing unit retransmits an authentication code to a first unit via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to the user wherein the first unit is the unit that sent user identification data to the authentication unit. In addition, Applicants respectfully request a showing as to where the cited reference teaches returning the authentication code back to the authentication unit in response to receiving the retransmitted authentication code and then authenticating the user when the returned authentication code is determined to be suitable.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. Again, by way of example, claim 4 requires that the second secondary channel is a short range channel that includes notifying, by the second unit, the first unit of a short range secondary channel used to receive the retransmitted authentication code for the third unit. The office action cites column 21, lines 19-22. However, as claimed, the second secondary channel is the channel used by the intermediate destination unit to retransmit the authentication code to the first unit. In the cited section, there only appears to be a remote system and a home

system and not an intermediate destination unit or a first unit nor an authentication unit as required by the claims, particularly where the "Response to Arguments" section indicates that the intermediate unit is alleged to be a connection management unit or the correspondence establishing unit. As importantly, Applicants are unable to find any mention of any short range secondary channel that receives a retransmitted authentication code in the cited portion. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 6, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made in the previous office action and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim.


As to claims 8, 9 and 10, these claims are also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and as such, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 20, 2005

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005